

ANDREW L. MEEKS, II,) 3:10-cv-00474-HDM-VPC
)
Plaintiff,)
)
vs.) ORDER
)
E. PETERMAN, et al.,)
)
Defendants.)
)

On June 20, 2011, plaintiff filed a motion to strike the defendants' opposition to his objections to the magistrate judge's report and recommendation (#34). Defendants' opposed the motion to strike on June 22, 2011 (#35). Defendants argue the motion to

1 strike is moot because the court had already adopted the magistrate
2 judge's report and recommendation. Plaintiff did not reply.

3 On July 13, 2011, plaintiff appealed this court's order
4 adopting the magistrate's report and recommendation(#36). On
5 August 10, 2011, plaintiff's appeal was dismissed for lack of
6 jurisdiction (#39). The mandate was filed on September 1, 2011
7 (#40). This court's order on the mandate was filed on September 6,
8 2011 (#41).

9 The court having jurisdiction over this action again hereby
10 DENIES plaintiff's motion to strike (#34) as moot having already
11 adopted the magistrate judge's report and recommendation when the
12 motion to strike was filed.

13 IT IS SO ORDERED.

14 DATED: This 12th day of September, 2011.

15 
16 UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28